



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

then *uni* fits the sense perfectly. To penetrate the sense is especially necessary if one would understand Tibullus, as Lachmann long ago pointed out. Failure to work deeply into the sense is evident in the readings proposed, i. 9. 25; ii. 2. 17-22; ii. 4. 43, etc.

If the dissertation makes no real improvements in the text of the *Corpus Tibullianum*, we must look for its contribution to Tibullian scholarship in the by-products—such collections of material, for example, as those on the ellipsis of *esse* (pp. 181-82, 224-25), on *seu* and *sive* (p. 207)—and in the full, clear discussions of the passages examined. It is a useful piece of work to put into the hands of beginners in text criticism, not because it attains proved results, but because the author sees what points require proof and how the evidence is to be sought. The critique of the views of others is generally well grounded, although inability to consult Cartault's edition (1909) and the last edition of Schulze's *Römische Elegiker* (1910) has caused the author in a few cases to misrepresent these scholars.

Textual emendation is a fascinating exercise for all who have caught more than the surface meaning of a text, but it may be seriously questioned whether in general it is a proper field for writers of dissertations. The chances of adding anything worth while to the sum of human knowledge are very slight, and even seasoned scholars are too prone to rush their *alucinationes* into print. But whatever may be thought about the general question, at least the dissertationist should be warned off from such texts as the *Corpus Tibullianum*.

Ut tibi succedat vix semel esse potest.

ARTHUR L. WHEELER

BRYN MAWR COLLEGE

Disputatio Critica de Carminibus Horatii Sex Quae Dicuntur Odae Romanae. By A. P. H. A. SLIJPEN. Amsterdam dissertation. Leyden: Théonville, 1912. Pp. viii+182.

A contribution to the extensive literature dealing with the first six Odes of Horace's third book can hardly be expected to offer very much that is new and at the same time plausible. Slijpen's book served as a dissertation, but was primarily written in a prize contest in which these Odes were assigned as the subject with the limitation that the opinions of scholars from Mommsen to Corssen (1889-97) be critically examined and the writer's own interpretation given. This work Slijpen has done well, and thus the book is useful as a summary of what has been written on the subject during the period covered. Its diffuseness however is objectionable.

Slijpen agrees with most scholars that the six poems form a cycle. He considers the phrase *virginibus puerisque* to be the underlying idea, though he does not press this point too hard. He thus rejects Mommsen's suggestion that the praise of Augustus is the chief motive, though he is willing to accept

certain details brought out by Mommsen. Nor does he see any truth in Domaszewski's theory that Horace puts into poetic form the words that the emperor used of himself in the *Monumentum Ancyranum*. Horace was not a pigeon-holing historian, as Mommsen and Domaszewski would have him be.

As has been intimated, Slijpen's greatest success is in his destructive criticism, and therein he shows considerable acuteness. In his own suggestions he is not so happy. For example, in the second poem he misinterprets the *silentium* of vs. 25 as *cultus deorum* and further makes the unconvincing argument that the second poem deals with virtue in the abstract while the other five deal with various concrete features of virtue.

It is comforting to find that Slijpen's careful study of the literature results in the rejection of many fanciful ideas that have been advanced concerning these poems.

B. L. ULLMAN

UNIVERSITY OF PITTSBURGH

The Clausula in Ammianus Marcellinus. By AUSTIN MORRIS HARMON, New Haven, Conn. Published under the auspices of Yale University, 1910. Pp. 128.

In this pamphlet, reprinted from the *Transactions of the Connecticut Academy of Arts and Sciences*, Vol. XVI, the author has presented the results of a study of the accentual clausula of Ammianus Marcellinus, selecting for that purpose the sentence-clausulae of the first six and the last three books, and all the clausulae, internal as well as final, in Book xxi of the *Histories*. The clausulae of Book xxi are printed in full; the data for the other books are presented only in statistical form. Harmon uses Meyer's symbols for indicating the stressed and unstressed syllables in accentual prose, but combines with Meyer's notation the classification as to form and type of caesura which Zielinski applies to the metrical prose of Cicero. He finds that Ammianus uses both in final and in internal clausulae a very limited range of accentual rhythms of which the following may alone be classed as regular: I, $\bar{x} \sim \sim \bar{x} \sim$, II, $\bar{x} \sim \sim \bar{x} \sim \sim$, III, $\bar{x} \sim \sim \sim \sim \bar{x} \sim$, IV, $\bar{x} \sim \sim \sim \sim \bar{x} \sim \sim$. The last is relatively rare. The prevailing caesura in I and II is γ and δ , in III and IV it is δ . As regards quantity—and here the author has shown great keenness and resourcefulness in securing and weighing the evidence—he finds that in accented syllables Ammianus was entirely indifferent to quantitative distinctions, and that in unaccented syllables he observes quantity only in so far as it is due to position.

Many of the inferences which he draws from the evidence of the clausula as to accent, syllabification, pronunciation, etc., are interesting and cannot be overlooked by students in the field of late Latin. One may mention the accentuation of Greek proper names and other loan words, the dialysis in the case of inter-vocalic *i*, e.g., Trafanus, Aquileia, and in particular the